

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **December 21, 2004** the examiner reviewed claims 1-45. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract appears to be written as if it were a claim and is not in narrative form. There appears to be a typographical error in the specification (page 1, line 35-page 2, line 1), “follow the the BMP model” should read “follow the BMP model”. Claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 23-42 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner et al. (USPN 6,085,198, hereinafter “Skinner”) in view of Forthman et al. (USPN 6,408,312, hereinafter “Forthman”).

Objection to the Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is not in narrative form.

Applicant has amended the Abstract to be in narrative form.

Objection to the Specification

There appears to be a typographical error in the specification.

Applicant has amended the specification to remove the typographical error.

Objection to the claims

Claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 23-42 and 45 were rejected because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter.

Applicant has amended independent claims 23, 31, 33, 41, and 45 to tangibly embody elements cited in the preambles of the various claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 were rejected as being unpatentable over Skinner in view of Forthman. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Skinner and Forthman teaches allowing for the use of dynamically created graphic representations based on information **stored in a relational database** (see Forthman, col. 3, lines 9-19).

In contrast, the present invention relates to **maintaining consistency** between objects in a first object storage system (database) and objects in a second object storage system (database) (see page 7, lines 6-20 of the instant application). Maintaining consistency between objects within multiple storage systems is different than dynamically creating graphic representations based on information stored in a single database. There is nothing within Skinner or Forthman, either explicit or implicit, which suggests maintaining consistency between objects in a first object storage system and objects stored in a second object storage system.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 to clarify that the present invention maintains consistency between objects in a first object storage system and objects stored in a second object storage system. These amendments find support on page 7, lines 6-20 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 31, 33, 41, and 43-45 as presently amended are in condition for allowance.

Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-22, which depend upon claim 12, claims 24-30, which depend upon


claim 23, claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, claims 34-40, which depend upon claim 33, and claim 42, which depends upon claim 41, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: January 11, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665